

Guidance on digital marketing practices and promotions in support of the PhonepayPlus Code of Practice - A PhonepayPlus Consultation

Introduction

We thank PpP for the opportunity to respond to the above consultation and welcome their attempts to clarify the use of such services for the UK consumer.

Q.1: Do you agree with our assessment of digital marketing in the PRS context and with our overall approach for dealing with it? If not, why not?

We agree with your overall assessment and approach. It is interesting to note that you say that market affiliates have a large impact, yet these individuals/companies are not required to register themselves under your code.

Q.2: Do you agree with our consideration of typosquatting and proposed expectation? If not, why not?

We agree

Q.3: Do you agree with our consideration of Clickjacking and our proposed expectations? If not, why not?

We agree

Q.4: Do you agree with our consideration of Likejacking and our proposed expectations? If not, why not?

We agree

Q.5: Do you agree with PhonepayPlus' consideration of banner ads, pop-ups and pop-unders and our expectations around them? If not, why not?

We agree

Q.6: Do you agree with PhonepayPlus' definition of SEM and SEO and our expectations around them? If not, why not?

We agree

Q.7: Do you agree with our consideration of content locking practices and our expectations around them? If not, why not?

We agree

Q.8: Do you agree with PhonepayPlus' consideration of spam and our related expectations? If not, why not?

We agree

Q.9: Are there any other potentially misleading digital marketing practices that we have not identified? If so, then please suggest any, including appropriate evidence.

None that we are aware of at this time

Q.10: Do you agree with our illustrative representation of affiliate marketing? If not, why not?

We agree

Q.11: Do you agree with our consideration of affiliate marketing and our expectations? If not, why not?

As stated above we fail to understand why affiliates who are not normally directly employed by a company but get revenues form a share of the premium rate do not have to register with PpP.

Conclusion

We notice that many of the issues outlined in this consultation have arisen due to the exclusion of market affiliates from having to register as part of the code revision. All ambiguity may lead to issues, it seems unfair that the tier 2 operators should be held solely responsible for the actions of someone whilst an affiliate marketer, getting revenue from PRS is not treated in the same way and held accountable for harm. Surely they are the polluter and should pay as your code has underpinned.